

REMARKS

The claims have been amended by changing claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, and 15, canceling claims 3 and 6, and adding no new claims. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 7-15 are in the application.

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 3, 9, 10, and 15 were objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(a) as being unclear.

Claims 2 and 9 have been amended to correct their antecedent basis, and thereby, the antecedent basis of claims 3 and 10, thus rendering them clear. Claim 15 is canceled, rendering moot the objections to it

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(b):

Claims 1, 4, 5, 9, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Basu [US Patent 6,594,629], for the same reasons as in the previous Office Action. Claims 1 and 14 have been amended, rendering this rejection of claims 1, 4, 5, 9, and 14 moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(e):

Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, and 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sutton [US Patent 6,539,354] using the same rationale as in the Office action mailed June 28, 2005, and for supplemental reasons. Claims 1 and 14 have been amended, rendering this rejection of claims 1, 4, 5, 9, and 14 moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a):

Claims 6-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Basu (US Patent 6,594,629) in view of David J. Thomson, "An Overview of Multiple-Window and Quadratic-Inverse Spectrum Estimation Methods," IEEE 1994, pp. VI 185-VI 194. Claims 6-8 are dependent upon claim 1, and therefore applicants concludes this rejection is rendered moot for the reasons given above for claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a):

Claims 3 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sutton (US Patent 6,539,354) in view of Peterson et al [US Patent 5,067,095]. Claims 3 and 11 are dependent upon claim 1, and therefore applicants concludes this rejection is rendered moot for the reasons given above for claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a):

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Basu (US Patent 6,594,629) in view of David J. Thomson, "An Overview of Multiple-Window and Quadratic-Inverse Spectrum Estimation Methods and Peterson et al [US Patent 5,067,095]," IEEE 1994, pp. VI 185-VI 194. Claim 15 is canceled, rendering this rejection moot

Applicant believes that amended claims 1, 12, 13, and 14 are patentable over Basu, or Sutton, or Peterson, or Thomson, either singly or in any combination with each other or any other art cited in this case, and therefore believes that claims 2, 4, 5, 7-11, and 15 are patentable, inasmuch as they depend upon amended claim 1

Combining Peterson with either Sutton or Basu under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) to reject amended claims 1, 12, 13, or 14 would be improper. Peterson describes a neural network that has as its input an analog acoustic waveform. Peterson does not discuss "receiving successive frames of digitized analog speech information obtained from the audio speech signal at a fixed rate" nor "synchronously generating a sequence of a set of visemes wherein each set of visemes in the sequence is derived from a corresponding one of the time domain frame classification vectors".

Applicant notes that any amendments or claim cancellations made herein and not substantively discussed above are made solely for the purposes of more clearly and particularly describing and claiming the invention, and not for purposes of overcoming art. The Examiner should infer no (i) adoption of a position with respect to patentability, (ii) change in the Applicant's position with respect to any claim or subject matter of the invention, or (iii) acquiescence in any way to any position taken by the Examiner, based on such amendments or cancellations not substantively discussed. Furthermore, any remarks made herein with respect to a given claim or amendment are intended only in the context of that specific claim or amendment, and should not be applied to other claims, amendments, or aspects of Applicant's invention.

Applicant specifically reserves the right to prosecute claims of differing and broader scope than those presented herein, in a continuation application.

This application is believed to be in proper form for allowance and an early notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to 502117.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department

Customer Number: 22917

By: /James A. Lamb/_____
James A. Lamb
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 38,529
Telephone: (847) 576-5054
Fax No.: (847) 576-3750
Email: jim.lamb@motorola.com